

Subject: **Draft Summary of Rep. Speier Dog Mgt Plan meeting(1/30/14)**

A. **Recreation Area**- many (include Rep Speier) still confusing the park's name with a persistent call to "accommodate all recreation" users, primarily off-leash dogwalkers, and accommodate the needs of "our taxpayers(mostly referring to the local ones with dogs off-leash)." Speier: "GGNRA has to be for all" (ie. by adding more dog off-leash areas).

B. **Overwhelming Comments on plan(?)**-repeated questioning why park isn't listening to them in continuing same off-leash use at park sites (to pre-existing or historic levels). San Mateo biggest cited example because of no areas in plan open for off-leash(**which Speier insisted would not prevail). (eg. Rancho)

C. **ADA accessibility**-ADA visitors with dogs: how can they be accommodated at places like Crissy, Funston to get to those designated dog areas?

D.**Punishing all off-leash for violations of few**-better enforcement against violators argument. (Fail to recognize the majority are violators, not few). They were recommending training, education and permits.

E. **Boulder Colorado program**-lauded by Martha Walters and picked up by Speier to evaluate; Frank did good job of questioning it's success. Need to square root this info and get to Speier in coming month(can I get the evaluation of this program?). I recall references to lack of success in our SEIS also; however, we probably will need original docs from Colorado group implementing it.

F. **Stakeholder group Citizens Advisory Committee**-Martha and Speier talked about this as solution to find common ground, and to collaborate to manage issues that come up(including considering how off-leash and other interests can work together). We have been there and done that with Neg Rule-making group. There is fruit there in working within "existing"(not new) county land mgt agencies's meetings on county/regional approach and strategy for off-leash recreation.(We should continue to manage this soon in follow up with Marlene rather than have Speier try to establish something under Congressional directive or letter to DOI).

G. **Dispersement of impact on to county**-Frank handled this well also stating that as SF Rec and Park knew this type of forecasting was not fruitful, though attempted. Folks still see GGNRA as the big landowner when SF REC and Park actually has more land in SF by acreage(it's just that GGNRA's is more scenic, ala beaches). Marlene Finley allowed re-opening of considering San Mateo parks again. We need to take her up on such reconsideration thru Land mgt group in San Mateo that we have now(Howard?).Neil Desai(NPCA) questioned putting the burden for off-leash on GGNRA. Supv Wiener(and Phil Ginsberg) felt that SF had done its part with improving 28 dog off-leash areas(though one comment noted parents of small children felt isolated at one of their premier "experimental" parks, Dubois).

H. **Commercial Dogwalking**-Martha W.'s comment about having dealt with that under Neg Rulemaking for up to 6 dogs with permit was good recognition of our agreement. Phil Ginsberg, head of SF Rec and Park, asserted that City's and GGNRA's needed to be same(though he is aware Scott Wiener's proposed legislation is for up to 8 dogs. Perhaps, Scott will get the message that needs to be reduced so that it is compatible with our higher, measured NPS standard. Can we work this message back thru Phil G?

I. **Political Opposition to our pref alternative**-11-0 bd. of supes vote noted by Supervisor Wiener with his underscoring that Mayor also supported their opposition. What proof of Mayor Lee's opposition do we have? If this is continually cited to local Congressional reps, it will further local Congressional interest in pushing back on us until "pre-existing off-leash use" is more accommodated in the pre alt. Do we have other agenda items coming in front of Mayor that we can use to get time with him(and/or Chief of Staff?) on this as well?

J. **Ocean Beach**-comment that problem is trash, not dogs: there is with many dog advocates simple failure to recognize the impacts of dogs off-leash on snowy plovers or other visitors. Mike Lyons(Audubon) softly raised issue of who was speaking for the dwindling shorebird and plover populations?

K. **Inability to take Small Children to Crissy and Ocean beach** due to dogs off-leash-one of opposing views to dogs off-leash that Rep Speier's allowed as moderator: Frank responded well that was one reason for separating sections of Crissy beaches(one for plovers; one for dogs; one for families) for instance.

L. **Voice Control**-recognition that not all dogs are under such when off-leash; however, off-leash advocates believe that required training is answer, and then enforcement when not obeyed(an untenable enforcement responsibility).

M. **Separated off-Leash Areas**: Mike Kyons asked Rep Speier if she stood by her 2005 letter recommending separating on and off-leash dog areas, and she said that she did because it gave folks different opportunities with their dogs for restful walk versus recreational exercise. Neal Desai(NPCA) recommended fencing off all dog off-leash areas as management tool as well; Frank said fencing could be used in some areas but not general tool. Dog off-leash advocates dissed this. Martha pointed out ED Wayburn, a founder of the park, used to have his dog off-leash in Crissy regularly(and obviously supported that). She also noted that Crissy was originally designed by park to accommodate off-leash dogs specifically(Nancy?).

N. **Speier's Wrap up**: Bay Area is about 'Innovation,' and we need to put together a plan conducive to "all recreational interests" since GGNRA is about "recreating." While challenges are greater, we want to work with you(the park) to address the "interests of our(local) taxpayers(speaking as rep for San Mateo and southern part of SF)." [Note: she did not use the phrase from her opening statement of all taxpayers].

Recommended Next Steps:

1. Provide me any clarifying points that I may have missed or misunderstood.[Speier's office did do a video tape and kept comment cards that they controlled].(**All**)
2. Outline talking point rebuttal to each major point above for Congressional point paper(**Michael, Myself**).
3. Develop Congressional strategy(local and WASO)[**Howard, Chris**].
4. Contact Marlene F. on process for broader off-leash considerations in San Mateo[**Frank, Me**].
5. Develop local news points; Work with other local voices so that broader views are published(**Howard; Alex**).
6. Develop refinement of San Mateo pref. alt based on closer look[**Christine; Nancy**].
7. Set up WASO meetings/telcons within next 1-2 months to address rising Congressional interest based on off-leash Congress. strategy(**Frank, Me, Chris**).
8. Contact Phil Ginsberg on City/county legislation on our rationale for commercial dog-walking numbers, and how he can advocate consistency with our numbers(**Frank, Me, with backup from Jessica, Kevin & Michael**).